

REMARKS**Objections to the Specification**

In the Office Action on page 2, various objections to the specification were noted.

Applicant has amended the specification to overcome these objections as follows:

- on page 13, line 17, the word “is” was changed to “has” to correct a structural inconsistency in the sentence at that section of the specification;
- on page 18, line 1, the word “braches” was changed to “branches” to correct a misspelling; and
- on page 23, line 16, the hyperlink was removed.

Applicant believes the above changes to the specification overcomes the Examiner’s objections to the specification. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the above objections to the specification be withdrawn

Claim Objections

In the Office Action on page 3, claims 1-16 were objected to because of various informalities. Applicant has now amended the claims to address these concerns. In claim 1 at the step of “selecting,” the words “the data in the document” are now changed to “the data in each document” to indicate a subset of all chunks is selected as representative of data in each document. Also in claim 1, in the step of “determining,” the words “a set of coefficients that represent selected chunks” are now changed to “a set of coefficients that represent the selected chunks in each document” to indicate that a set of coefficients that represent the selected chunks in each document is determined at this step.

In claim 6, the word “is” is now replaced with the words “as in” to correct a typographical error.

In claim 11 at step “f,” the word “this” is now replaced with the word “the” to refer to an established antecedent for “subset.”

Applicant believes the above changes to the claims overcomes the Examiner’s objections to claims 1-16. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the objections to claims 1-16 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections

At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 1-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being indefinite to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Specifically, the Examiner notes that in the original claim 1 the words “by counting clusters” was indefinite. Applicant has now amended claim 1 to change the words “by counting clusters” to “by counting coefficient clusters.”

In the original claim 9, the Examiner notes that the words “a sufficient degree of similarity” was indefinite. Applicant has now amended claim 9 to change the words “a sufficient degree of similarity” to “a predetermined degree of similarity.”

In the original claim 11, the Examiner notes that the words “most similar” in step “e” was indefinite. Applicant has now amended step “e” in claim 11 to change the words “most similar” to “similar.”

Applicant believes the above changes to the claims overcomes the Examiner’s rejections of claims 1-16. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 1-16 be withdrawn.

At page 4 of the Office Action, claims 6, 9-11, 15 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 for reciting limitations with insufficient antecedent basis.

Specifically, the Examiner notes that the words “the vectors” in the original claim 6 lacked an antecedent basis. Applicant has now amended claim 6 to change the words “the vectors” to “the sets.”

In the original claim 9, the Examiner notes that the words “wherein the step of comparing” and “the hierarchy” lacked an antecedent basis. Applicant has now amended claim 9 to change the words “wherein the step of comparing” to “wherein the step of evaluating” and, the words “A method as in claim 1” to “A method as in claim 8.”

Applicant believes the above changes to the claims overcomes the Examiner’s rejections of claims 6, 9-11, 15 and 16. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of claims 6, 9-11, 15 and 16 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By Michael J. Badzinski

Michael J. Badzinski

Registration No. 51,425

Telephone: (978) 341-0036

Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: 1/20/05